

Digest urth.v028.n186

The Urth list — 2 messages, 2 voices, 19 Apr 2000

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/2201>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Paul C Duggan — 19 Apr 2000, 14:33

On Wed, 19 Apr 2000 alga wrote:

The scholarship is not that "contemporary" regarding Revelation. It was suspect from the gitgo, with several more sober bishops strongly objecting to it when the 4th century canon was put together. It crawled in because of popular superstition that John the gospeleer wrote it, though more educated folk with a good "ear" even at that early time found this highly unlikely, and said so. There were lots of similarly apocalyptic texts around, this one being an anti-Rome rant with historical references to Babylon, Israel's prior primo peeve.

Its also been suggested that the main enemy, and actual identity of Babylon (besides Rome) is non-Christian Judaism ("those who say they are Jews and are not", and all) I would think "modern scholarship" would find that fits right in with the Johnaine "anti-semitism" (as if that term had any contextual utility, which I think it probably doesn't [but that doesn't stop US News and World Report from mentioning it])

Modern
textual analysis makes the two completely incompatible.

I wonder how on earth anyone goes about proving something like that. John's gospel is structurally based abound sevens (seven "I am's", seven miraculous signs, a "seven day creation" in the first chapter) and everyone is well aware of the seven-fold structure of Revelation. Seems that would make them quite compatible.

Paul

Ron Hale-Evans — 19 Apr 2000, 11:51 · follows Paul C Duggan

At 02:33 PM 4/19/00 -0400, you wrote:

Modern
textual analysis makes the two completely incompatible.

I wonder how on earth anyone goes about proving something like that. John's gospel is structurally based abound sevens (seven "I am's", seven miraculous signs, a "seven day creation" in the first chapter) and everyone is well aware of the seven-fold structure of Revelation. Seems that would make them quite compatible.

Paul

Computer analysis of word frequency and other stylistic features. Pretty standard in contemporary scholarship.

Ron H-E

Ron Hale-Evans: [rwhe at apocalypse.org](mailto:rwhe@apocalypse.org) ... <<http://www.apocalypse.org/~rwhe/>>
Center for Ludic Synergy: <<http://www.ludism.org/>>
Kennexions GBG artgame: <<http://kennexions.ludism.org/>>
Hexagram-8 I Ching Mailing List: <<http://www.apocalypse.org/~rwhe/hex8.html>>

Positive Revolution FAQ: <<http://www.ludism.org/posrev/>>